



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/897,217 07/14/97 DEAN

D P-2057/723

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG
WOESSNER & KLUTH PA
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

LM51/0603

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2758
DATE MAILED:

06/03/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/897,217

Applicant(s)
Dawson F. Dean

Examiner
Lewis Bullock, Jr.

Group Art Unit
2755



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lewis Bullock, Jr.

(3) _____

(2) Bradley A. Forrest

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 19, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21

Identification of prior art discussed:

U.S. Patent 5,754,857 Gadol

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant wanted to discuss a proposed amendment with the potential of making claims allowable. Applicant proposed to amend the claims such that the applet and applet viewer execute in the same computer system which executes remote procedure calls. Primary reference taught the functionality of the applet to the reference making remote procedure calls were in two different computing systems. Therefore, it was the examiners position that the proposed amendment to the claims would overcome the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

ALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.